

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 15, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the specification drawings, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application and are resubmitted for consideration.

The Office Action objected to the drawings on several grounds. The Office Action alleged that Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art," because the specification provides that those figures are prior art. Applicants have submitted Replacement Drawing Sheets that add the designation of "Prior Art" to Figs. 1a, 1b and 2. Entry and approval of the Replacement Drawing Sheets are respectfully requested.

The Office Action also objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), alleging that the drawings fail to show appropriate details as described in the specification. The Office Action was not explicit as to what was allegedly not illustrated, and the Applicants have assumed that the Examiner was concerned that elements of the claims were not explicitly illustrated. With respect to claims 1-11, Applicants have included another drawing that illustrates the method steps of claim 1 in the form of a flowchart. With respect to claims 12-23, Applicants have included another drawing illustrating elements of the conference server 12. It is believed that the additional drawings respond to the objections raised in the Office Action. Entry and approval of the Replacement Drawing Sheets are respectfully requested.

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend the drawings according to the attached Replacement Drawing Sheets. Figs. 1a, 1b and 2, Sheets 1/3 and 2/3, have been amended to add the legend “Prior Art” to those figures. Figs. 4 and 5, sheet 3/3, have been added to illustrate the elements of claims 1 and 12, respectively. Support for the added figures may be found at pages 4 and 5 of the specification.

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheets 1/3, 2/3 & 3/3

Claims 1, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Castell et al. et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0098831). Claims 2-11 and 14-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Castell et al. et al.* in view of *Schuster et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,622). The rejection acknowledges that *Castell et al. et al.* fails to teach the transmission of a third message comprising an network address and cites *Schuster et al.* as curing this deficiency. Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for administering conferencing resources in a communications system having a plurality of terminals and a conference server. The method includes transmitting from a first terminal to the server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call and transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1.

Claim 12 is directed to a conference server for administering conferencing resources in a communications system having a plurality of terminals. The conference server includes a receiver unit for receiving from a first terminal a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, an allocation unit for allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the

conference call and a transmission unit for transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address.

As discussed in the present specification, the present invention enables the setting up of conference calls on communications systems. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of *Castell et al. et al.* and *Schuster et al.*, when viewed or when combined, fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims. Therefore, the prior art fails to provide the critical and unobvious advantages discussed above.

Castell et al. discloses a system in which a mobile device sends a command to a unified messaging system, the command including data such as details of conference call participants (page 7, paragraph [0054], first and last sentences). A PBX is then adapted to set up voice calls to the mobile device and to the other parties specified in the initial command (page 7, paragraph [0055], third and fourth sentences).

Claim 1 recites, in part, “transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address,” and claim 12 recites, in part, “a transmission unit for transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address.” Specifically, there is no disclosure in *Castell et al.* of the method step of transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address or a transmission unit as recited in claim 12.

The present application is directed to a system in which the requesting *mobile device is issued by a server with the address of a conferencing resource* which has been allocated to the mobile device. In specific embodiments of the present invention, the user

of the requesting mobile device can then send the address of the resource to other users. The users can then “dial in” to a call (page 8, last paragraph to page 10, first full paragraph). As indicated by the independent claims, a message comprising the network address of the allocated resource is transmitted to the first terminal. Such a disclosure is not recited in *Castell et al.* for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the anticipation rejection over *Castell et al.* is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action alleges that the disclosure at page 7, paragraph [0054] of *Castell et al.* that “the PBX engages the voice component of the mobile device” is an inherent disclosure of transmission of a message comprising the address as claimed. However, the system disclosed in *Castell et al.* is a very different arrangement from that of the present invention.

Not only does *Castell et al.* not make any explicit mention of an address of a resource, it also does not make any suggestion that it would be desirable for the requesting mobile device to be informed of such an address. At paragraph [0055], it is stated that “the PBX and voice-mail interface 210c uses the applicable API to request resources from the PBX component 120,” “the PBX system 120 sets up a voice call to the mobile device 100,” and “the PBX system 120 then makes all necessary phone calls using phone circuits to call the other parties 270.” *Castell et al.* thus makes it clear that in the system described, the conference call is controlled by the PBX rather than by the requesting mobile device.

In fact, this is explicitly stated at paragraph [0056], final sentence: “the PBX system 120 acts as a proxy owner of the conference, not the mobile user.” The system of *Castell et al.* is therefore a fundamentally different arrangement from that claimed in the present application. As such, for this additional reason Applicants respectfully assert that the anticipation rejection is improper because *Castell et al.* fails to teach all of the elements of claims 1 and 12.

In addition, Applicants also respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 are not rendered obvious in view of *Castell et al.* *Castell et al.* teaches away from arrangements that are controlled by a mobile user, thus suggesting that it is superfluous to transmit a resource address to a requesting mobile device. *Castell et al.* therefore provides a skilled person with no motivation to modify the disclosed arrangement in such a way as to require that a message be sent from a server to a mobile user incorporating an address of a resource. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 are also not obvious in view of *Castell et al.*

With respect to claims 2-11 and 14-23, the Office Action rejects those claims by also applying *Schuster et al.* *Schuster et al.* is directed to a system and a method for using a portable information device. The Office Action alleges that *Schuster et al.* teaches the transmission of a third message. Even if the teaching alleged in the Office Action were accepted, they would not cure the deficiencies of *Castell et al.* noted above.

Similarly, claims 2-11 and 13-23 depend from claims 1 and 12, and should be allowed for at least their dependence on those independent claims. In view of the above,

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-23 each recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in a combination of *Castell et al.* and *Schuster et al.* The allowance of all claims is requested and Applicants respectfully request that the present application be allowed to proceed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin F. Turner
Registration No. 43,437

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KFT:jf

Enclosures: Replacement Drawing Sheets